

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
8 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
9 AT SEATTLE

10 TIMOTHY C. MYER and JOHN E.
11 GRISWOLD,

12 Plaintiffs,

13 CASE NO. C06-804C

14 v.
15 NITETRAIN COACH COMPANY INC.;
16 NASHVILLE COACH, INC.,

17 Defendants.

18 ORDER

19 This matter comes before the Court on Defendant Nashville Coach's Motion to Continue
20 Deadline for Mediation (Dkt. No. 37), Plaintiffs' Response thereto (Dkt. No. 39), and Defendant's Reply
21 (Dkt. No. 41). The Court, having carefully considered all of the papers submitted and determined that
22 oral argument is not necessary, hereby finds and rules as follows.

23 The basic facts of this case have been recited in prior Orders of this Court. (*See* Orders (Dkt.
24 Nos. 22, 36).) Defendant's instant motion sought to extend the mediation deadline in this case to July 13,
25 2007 as well as an order compelling Plaintiff Myer to provide "all updated medical records, and any
26 discoverable material related to a neuropsychologist's evaluation." (Mot. 4.) In response, Plaintiff
 indicated that all parties have already agreed to a continuance of the mediation date to June 4, 2007, but

27
28 ORDER - 1

1 objected to the request to compel because, Plaintiff argued, it was an improper attempt to seek a Rule
2 26(a)(2) expert report before such is due. In Reply, Defendant agreed to a June 4, 2007 mediation
3 deadline, denied that it was seeking expert disclosures early, and requested that Plaintiff be required to
4 make and supplement initial disclosures, pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 26(a)(1)(A) and
5 26(e)(1).

6 There is no controversy regarding the mediation date. Accordingly, this joint request is
7 GRANTED and the mediation deadline shall be extended to June 4, 2007.

8 As to the “neuropsychological report,” it is clear that Plaintiff is not required to provide an expert
9 report before such is due under Rule 26(a)(2). However, Plaintiff is required to provide and supplement
10 requested discovery as a general matter, including treating physician information, pursuant to Rules
11 26(a)(1)(A) and 26(e)(1). These requirements already bind Plaintiff and there is no need for an Order
12 from this Court to impose them. Moreover, Defendant has not made a showing that it has satisfied the
13 requirement to meet and confer with Plaintiff about Rule 26 discovery requests as dictated by Local Rule
14 37(a)(2). Instead, Defendant only invokes Rules 26(a)(1)(A) and 26(e)(1) in its Reply to the instant
15 motion. Accordingly, the Court DENIES Defendant’s request to require specific discovery already
16 required by the Federal Rules by any particular date. Plaintiff is reminded of the ongoing duty to
17 supplement disclosures under Rule 26(e)(1).

18 SO ORDERED this 4th day of May, 2007.

19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26


John C. Coughenour
United States District Judge